

S/N: 09/222,554  
Response to Office Action dated October 5, 2006  
Amendment dated February 5, 2007

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-9, and 13-25 are pending in the application.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-3, 8-9, 13-14, 17-22, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skopp et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,256,739 (hereinafter “Skopp”) in view of Broder et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,037,135 (hereinafter “Broder”) in view of Cooper et al. , U.S. Patent No. 6,1010,503 (“Cooper”). Claims 4-7 and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skopp, Border and Cooper in further view of Markowitz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,311,185 B1 (hereinafter “Markowitz”). Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skopp, Broder, and Cooper in further view of Yu, U.S. Patent No. 6,067,552 (hereinafter “Yu”). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skopp.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection in view of the following arguments.

In the previous Amendment, the Applicants argued that the newly cited Skopp reference does not teach automatically determining a content data of a given information unit by searching the given information unit or automatically selecting the chosen information unit as a function of the content data of the given information unit. The current Office Action repeats the rejections from the previous Office Action, and provides an additional Response to Arguments section. In that section, the Examiner argues as follows:

The fact that a user can view a predetermined list of related Web pages where the web page associated with a selected advertisement would be displayed shows that the web page relates to the selected advertisement in content. The web page here is not only associated with the advertisement but also relates to the advertisement. In other words, the content data of the web page is determined and the web page related to an advertisement is automatically selected for displaying. (emphasis in original).

The cited text of Skopp (Col. 5, lines 26-35 and 58-67) is reproduced below for convenience:

The off-line user could select an advertisement from the banner 240 to automatically initiate the limited access to the Internet 100. The user PC 200 would request and receive Web page information through a Web proxy 510 and proxy control processor 530, and the Web page associated with the selected advertisement would be displayed. Although the user would be allowed to view a pre-determined list of related Web pages, other Web page requests would be rejected by the system 510, 530.

**and**

The client access control application 210 also resides on the user PC 200. The client access control application 210 can be used to initiate a Web browsing session. For example, the client access control application 210 can display an index of advertisements to a user. When the user selects an advertisement from the index, the client access control application 210 can activate the browser application 220 and obtain a Web page associated with that advertisement. As explained in detail below, the user will only be allowed to access the Web page, or group of Web pages, associated with that advertisement. If desired, the user can then select a different advertisement from the index and view its associated Web page or pages.

According to Skopp, a user can view a predetermined list of related web pages associated with an advertisement. Though the web page content may be related to the selected advertisement, there is no disclosure in Skopp as to automatic determination of the content of a given information unit by searching the given information unit. Such is missing from the quoted

S/N: 09/222,554

Response to Office Action dated October 5, 2006

Amendment dated February 5, 2007

section of the Office Action above. Looking at the quoted sections of Skopp, there is no description whatsoever of searching a given information unit to automatically determine its content. Lacking such a description, it is not conceivable that Skopp provides any suggestion of how one would create a system or method for automatic determination of the content of a given information unit.

Indeed, Skopp teaches away from the features of the claims. The web pages that are available to be viewed by a user are stored (via their URL) in a database entry associated with an advertisement. It is the advertiser that seeks to limit the web pages that are viewed by the user. See, for example, Col. 2, lines 47-55 of Skopp where the cost for Internet access is either free or at a reduced cost. As known in the art (especially with respect to the services provided by Juno Online, the assignee of the Skopp patent), low cost Internet access is provided in exchange for persistent advertisements on the user's computer. The advertiser cannot afford to allow access to all or even a large number of web-pages that are "related" to its advertisement. Accordingly, to populate the database with a limited number of web pages, the advertiser would want to limit viewership to only a limited number of web pages selected by the advertiser (Col. 2, lines 51-55). To make such a selection would necessitate that the selection be done manually. There is simply nothing in Skopp suggesting an automatic selection or an automatic selection by searching a given information unit as called for in the claims. Since this feature is missing from Skopp and missing from the remaining cited references (as detailed in the previous Amendments), the Office Action fails to make a *prima facie* case for obviousness of the pending claims.

Since features of the presently claimed invention are missing from the cited references, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-9 and 13-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

S/N: 09/222,554  
Response to Office Action dated October 5, 2006  
Amendment dated February 5, 2007

### CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,  
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: 2/5/07

By:



Shawn W. O'Dowd  
Reg. No. 34,687

KENYON & KENYON  
1500 K Street, NW  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 220-4200 telephone  
(202) 220-4201 facsimile  
DC1-648213